

Danner, Ward

From: Jennifer deNicola <jd18@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2013 12:59 PM
To: Wilson, Patrick
Cc: Baylor, Katherine
Subject: Re: Malibu plan
Attachments: Community Environmental Update 12-20-13.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Patrick:

Thank you for the reply. I would love to meet with Kathy to discuss all of this. I would like to hear her opinion and experience to weigh in on testing methods, options and resulting data! Please pass on my contact information to her, I would so appreciate that.

The plan you sent me, only states 5 rooms that are being worked on (1,5,8,301,library). The letter the parents received from the district mentions 10 other rooms. So if there are people onsite testing, they must have testing plan to follow or they would not know what to do, one we have not seen regarding these 10 other rooms. (I have attached the original email to the chain below so you can see the rooms I am speaking about)

Mark Katchen did not survey a group of teachers to make an assessment on open windows or not. So his argument that actual exposure testing would be with windows open on a cold day is without merit. I have been told by many teachers that they do not open their windows during the winter. In addition, the windows in all rooms are closed at night. When the kids arrive at school and enter the rooms, the rooms have been shut tight all night. We want to know what is in those rooms and use the best way to find that out, not an ideal risk assessment based on possible uses. We just need to discover what is causing the PCB exposure and reduce it. If we do not know the source than we cannot ensure that there will be no future exposure.

Adding ambient outdoor air in the room dilutes the test results. As parents we want to know if our kids are being exposed to any PCB's. At that point, we can determine the source and remove it so that no one will be exposed further. I understand the risk assessment issue, but you cannot access risk with bad testing data. Reliable data only comes from good test planning. As you have told me many times, if the worst case scenario is safe, then all scenarios are safe. That I can live with, but testing using methods that are proven to not find results or diminish them are not acceptable.

I have spoken to numerous PCB experts that work to discover sources of PCB's and they will affirm that you must test with the room sealed. They also highly suggest ventilation systems should be on with low air flow machines. Therefore, anything less will be highly criticized by the public. This would be bad for Malibu and bad for everyone involved.

The only goal is to test the school completely and thoroughly and find out what is wrong and fix it. We are not interested in putting a band-aid on this. We want to know beyond a shadow of doubt that our school is safe and is a healthy place for our kids and teachers to go to school to everyday. We need to know that 30 years down the line, they will not get sick because we failed to do everything necessary today to clean up our environment.

I hope you understand where we are all coming from and the importance of this matter to this community.

As always, I thank you for your help, advice, encouragement and assistance.

Jennifer deNicola
310-848-5400

On Dec 26, 2013, at 11:17 AM, Wilson, Patrick wrote:

Jennifer,

You may want to discuss this with Kathy Baylor when she is on-site next week?

We may be talking about the same plan - or there may be some confusion?

It is my understanding that pre-& post-cleaning testing of the room air will be done prior to the interim cleaning that is to be completed over the holiday break. The testing you refer to in your message may very well have been the pre-cleaning air testing? I am not sure, but this is my initial impression. It is difficult for me to imagine that an entirely new & separate plan for additional rooms has been developed & implemented since last Friday?

The issue of the windows being opened or closed during the testing regime can reasonably be argued both ways. Our last conversation with Mark (Friday of last week) included a discussion of conducting the testing with the windows closed to better evaluate potential worst-case conditions. Others raised the point that to be more reflective of the actual potential exposures that the students & teachers incur in a specific room - that in fact the rooms & windows should reflect the actual conditions that the teachers routinely configure their rooms with. That is to say, if the teachers open the windows in the winter while teaching - then that would be more representative of the actual conditions & air quality that the students & teachers are exposed to.

I'm not convinced that either room configuration is more appropriate than the other at this point. If the current testing regime is designed to assess potential worst case conditions, then it makes sense to have the windows & rooms sealed up. However, if we want to arrive at estimates of the actual health risk (likelihood of adverse health impacts from PCB exposures), then testing the rooms with the configuration that the teachers use them-in makes equally good sense.

Again, this may be something to discuss with Kathy Baylor next week. Kathy is our hydro-geologist & sampling & analysis expert. She has been collecting samples & conducting various levels of analysis on behalf of the Agency for more than 25 years.

She will be a wealth of information for you!

-----Original Message-----

From: Jennifer DENICOLA [mailto:jd18@me.com]

Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2013 10:33 AM

To: Wilson, Patrick

Subject: Re: Malibu plan

Patrick,

The holidays were quiet and warm! We actually went to the beach and the kids jumped in the ocean. I would say it was a polar bear plunge: ocean was cold, but the air was warm, so I am not sure it counts!

My last letter to you pointed out that the Mark Katchen was planning on testing 10 other rooms. That testing was done last weekend. That is a plan EPA should have reviewed. None if the task force has seen this plan. If Katchen planned on having the windows open during testing on the plan provided to the EPA, then it was

probably set up the same way on the other 10 room plan we did not see. In addition, we never saw a revised plan reflecting the EPA changes. The district is now on break.

In addition, if the EPA did not review the other plans, than can I assume the data will not be "EPA data." (what you guys call EPA's own data).

Will you let me know if you received revised plans? Also, would the other 10 room data collected be not considered EPA data?

Thank you,
Jennifer DeNicola

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 26, 2013, at 9:34 AM, "Wilson, Patrick" <Wilson.Patrick@epa.gov> wrote:

Good Morning Mrs. Denicola,

I hope you & your family enjoyed a terrific holiday!

Regarding your question, no, we have not recd. any additional testing or evaluation plans. We electronically forwarded to you the most recent plan that we recd. on Friday of last week.

My understanding is that Kathy Baylor, our sampling & analysis expert, will be on campus early to mid-part of next week to collect independent quality control & quality assurance samples.

Best Regards...

-----Original Message-----

From: Jennifer DENICOLA [mailto:jd18@me.com]

Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2013 9:09 AM

To: Wilson, Patrick

Subject: Malibu plan

Dear Patrick:

I sent you an email in Monday as well as left you a voicemail.

Please call me or reply to my email regarding if you have a testing plan for the other rooms (other than 1.5.8.301.library.)

Thank you and I hope you had a Merry Christmas!

Best Regards, Jennifer deNicola
310-848-5400

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Patrick:

I read the "Limited PCB Site Cleaning and Verification Sampling Work Plan for MHS..." and it only mentions room 1,5,8,310 and the library. Please see the attached letter below that Sandra Lyon sent out on Thursday, Dec 19th at 9pm to the entire school community.

Did the EPA receive another testing plan that was not forwarded to me? I ask because Sandra Lyon's letter talks about 10 other locations to test, clean and re-test. (this letter quoted in red)

Pre-Testing

Before the rooms are cleaned using the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) recommended best management practices, we will gather air samples from the rooms in the Blue Building that had not been previously sampled. These are rooms 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14 and 16. Additionally, we will gather air samples from the gym office adjacent to the girls' locker room, music rooms 302 and 303 and the storage closet adjacent to room 1. This pre-testing air sampling will take place beginning December 21 through December 22, 2013. This testing will give the District the ability to confirm that the best management practices cleaning is effective in reducing PCB concentrations in air and will create a record of current conditions in the event any questions arise after the cleaning. EPA is not requesting this testing; the District is undertaking the work to provide further assurances to the community as we return teachers and students to the previously vacated classrooms.

Rooms Cleaned using Best Management Practices

The District has discussed our cleaning plan with the EPA, Region 9 office, and will utilize the EPA's recommended best management to clean the vacated Blue Building, Library, gym office adjacent to the girls' locker room, and the three music rooms over the winter break. The cleaning will be conducted beginning December 23, 2013 and conclude by January 5, 2014. Although not required, our cleaning plan was discussed with, and approved by, the EPA, Region 9 office.

Have you seen a plan that refers to these rooms that the EPA approved? If so, please email me that plan. If not, please call me and email me back ASAP.

Thank you again for all your assistance. I will speak to you on Monday.

Jennifer deNicola